

COBBETT'S WEEKLY POLITICAL REGISTER.

VOL. 53.—No. 11.] LONDON, SATURDAY, MARCH 12, 1825. [Price 1s.

TO THE ELECTORS OF WESTMINSTER.

*On the Speech of Sir Francis
Burdett, of the 1st March,
1825, when he presented the
Petition of the Catholics of
Ireland.*

Kensington, 9th March, 1825.

GENTLEMEN,

I HAVE not addressed a letter to you, until now, since the 30th of June, 1821, at which time your Member, SIR FRANCIS BURDETT (who owed his first being your Member to me more than to any other human being), had, just then, most awkwardly got out of the "CRIB" affair, which he had had with Mr. CANNING. Since that time he, though "*Westminster's pride and England's glory*," has been little heard of, having, as far as I recollect, distinguished himself only by his *eulogium on Lord Wellesley*, in 1822, and by his speech in 1824, in which he ascribed all the miseries of Ire-

land to her "*surplus population*," and in which he proposed *transportation, or emigration, on a "grand scale."* My two Letters of 26th June and 3d July, 1825, commenting on that project, seemed to do the Baronet's business pretty completely; seemed to send him off, for "good and all," to that state of *repose* which the rumpite, ADAMS, seems to have anticipated, at the "*purity-of-election*" dinner, on the foregoing 23d of May. This ADAMS had been appointed to pronounce, at the purity dinner, the *annual eulogium on the man of many acres*. This post had been filled, for many years, by a sanctified toad-eater of the name of STURCH, an ironmonger, to whose *sincerity* the Baronet was first indebted for the titles of "*Westminster's pride and England's glory*;" but STURCH being dead (or *very sick*), and the office not being hereditary, like that of the Earl Marshal, ADAMS (currier, of Drury-lane), being next in seniority upon the roll of the RUMP, succeeded to it; but, having but a

X

[ENTERED AT STATIONERS' HALL.]

barren subject (the Baronet not having spoken a word in public for *more than a year*), and not having such a frosty, hard, and undissolvable face as STURCH, poor ADAMS became *flustered*, and hacked and stammered, as if in the way of imitating the *Westminster Ciceros*. He had no *achievement* to speak of, for his hero had been dumb as a post. Yet, he thought, that, having the honour to be toad-eater *ex-officio*, he must say *something* in praise of the "*hero comes*." At last, then, after a great deal of swinging of hand, bowing of head, stuttering, and sputtering, as if his mouth had been full of hot cockles, out came—"Our *glorious* representative has *laboured for us so hard, for so many years*, that he "may be excused for not doing "any thing more; and, gentlemen, "be assured, that *we shall never look upon his like again*."

This concluding remark smelt very strong of a *Drury-lane* garret. Quite poetical: but it sounded too much like a *farewell*, or, indeed, a *funeral oration*, for the Baronet to like it. He, therefore, as good as told his "worthy friend," Mr. ADAMS, that he was *not dead yet*; and that, in spite of the Rump (if necessary), he meant to keep his *seat* as long as he lived. Poor

ADAMS, who had been led astray merely by his *dramatic* turn (so natural to his local situation), eat his words with all possible haste, declared, that he had been wholly misunderstood, and was ready to be sworn upon *the bible* (without note or comment), that the worthy and "*glorious* representative" was then, and always had been, and always would be, a most *active* and *vigilant* and *efficient* Member of Parliament!

Farces like this have, in fact, been going on in Westminster for more than *twelve years*; and they will continue to be acted for the mutual benefit of the Rump on the one part, and of "Glory" and Hobhouse on the other part, until some great and general *squall* shall upset the concern, or until some man shall, *at an election*, come forward as a candidate, and resolutely expose the political slavery in which you now are, which is even *more degrading* than that from which you were delivered in 1807. But, let such a man come forward, and away go all the intrigues and the intriguers; and such a man *must come forward*: you are not to be *humbugged* at this rate for ever: you are not to stand *for ever*, and see city after city, though charged with Deans and Chapters, surpass you

in public spirit; you, who, for many years, set them all the example in every thing that was hostile to corruption.

Thus far, that which I have said may seem to have little to do with the subject stated at the head of my Letter; but, before I have done, you will see how it will connect itself with that subject.

The speech, mentioned above, and on which I am about to comment, was, you will bear in mind, published in the Morning Chronicle of the second instant, as having been made by SIR FRANCIS BURDETT, in the House of Commons, on the first instant. Now, mind, I do not say, that he really did utter this speech; but, it has appeared in print, and he as the author of it; and whether he uttered it or not, the effect must be the same; and that effect I deem to be extremely injurious, not only to the cause of Ireland, but to the interests of freedom and justice in every part of the kingdom.

It was made upon the occasion of presenting a petition from the Irish Catholics. And before we proceed further, let us see what was the nature of that petition. In Ireland there are about four hundred thousand Church Protestants; and the rest of the popu-

lation consists of about six millions of Catholics, with, perhaps, about half a million of Protestant Dissenters. The 400,000 have in their exclusive possession all the honours and all the emoluments of Church and State. The Catholics are excluded from being Sheriffs; from belonging to corporations; from the bar, all above king's counsel inclusive; from the bench; from all the offices in Chancery; from the Privy Council; and from seats in both Houses of Parliament. It will easily be seen by every man of sense, that, while the whole of the governing powers are thus withheld from these six millions of people, they must be a sort of outcasts. And you will, at once, without any detail of consequences being pointed out to you, perceive, that they cannot possibly be contented in this state.

Their discontents are, indeed, notorious and unceasing. The effects of them are as unceasingly repressed by force. In some parts of the country a law is in force for shutting the whole of the people up in their houses from sunset to sunrise! Aye, and for transporting them for seven years if they disobey; and that, too, by Justices of the Peace and one barrister, without trial by jury!

The law of the CURFEW, of William the Conqueror, has been represented as most detestably tyrannical. But, what was it? It only compelled people to put out *their lights* at *eight o'clock* in the evening, and to keep them extinguished till *four o'clock* in the morning. This could not apply to more than *half the year*; for, during the other half, their candles, between four in the morning and eight in the evening, be no need of lights. It did not forbid people from *going out of their houses* at any hour; it did not imprison people in their houses; and, indeed, it appears to me to have been nothing but an economical regulation, intended to promote early rising, sobriety, and an absence of dissolute manners. It was *rigid*, to be sure; but by no means tyrannical. The CURFEW-bells fell very slowly into disuse; and, unto this day, they exist, and are regularly tolled, in numerous towns and villages in England.

But, if the CURFEW have been justly characterised, what are we to say of the sunset and sunrise law in Ireland? Say? Why, the very best that we can say of it, is, that it is a thing of *imperious necessity*; that it is the only *alternative*; that the simple question is, *this law, or open rebellion.*

Well, then, this law has been in force in one part of the country or another, *for years*; ever since, at any rate, the Marquis of Wellesley has been the Lord-Lieutenant; and, observe, Sir Francis Burdett's imputed speech praises this Lord-Lieutenant to the skies! If, therefore, this praise be just, what must be the *radical state* of that system by which Ireland is governed?

And, pray do not believe that the Catholic sufferings are a matter in which *you are not interested*. The measures which the Government has thought proper to adopt with regard to *South America*, seem very likely to produce a *war*. Judge you what will be the effect of war, *upon Ireland*, if the complaints of six millions of her people remain unattended to! But, even *without war*, the *cost* of keeping Ireland in its present state amounts to many millions annually; and, be you assured, that you will in vain hope for *effectual relief from taxation*, as long as we have to pay that cost. It is, therefore, hardly more the affair of the Catholics than your own affair. If you laugh at their being shut up in their houses, they will do well to laugh at your being compelled to pay *window and house tax* towards the means of

causing them to be shut up. You ought to *join them in their petition*; and, if you do not, I am satisfied, that your conduct is to be ascribed, not to your want of sense or of justice; but to your having suffered your energies to be benumbed by that vile Rump, which now makes use of you for its own and its employer's purposes. In the affair of *the Queen*, how long did *Westminster hang back*! When you, at last, came out, you nobly did your duty; but never would you have come out *at all*, if this Rump and its master could have had their will. They themselves were *compelled* to come forward, at last; and thus will it be as to the cause of the Catholics, before that great affair be settled; or, if it be not thus, we shall all have to rue the consequences of those mean intrigues by which you are held back.

The PETITION of the Catholics, presented by Sir Francis Burdett, upon this occasion, prayed *for the removal of the odious and oppressive exclusions above mentioned*. At the time of presenting the petition, the Baronet moved for a COMMITTEE of the whole House, "to consider the state of the laws by which Oaths and Declarations are required to be taken or

made, as qualifications to the enjoyment of offices, or for the exercise of civil functions, so far as the same affect His Majesty's Roman Catholic subjects, and whether it would be expedient in any, and what manner to alter or modify the same, and subject to what provisions or regulations."

This motion was carried by 247 against 234; and Sir FRANCIS BURDETT then moved for leave to bring in a *Bill* on the subject, which Bill is to come before the House *after the Easter recess*. Well, then, one might be tempted to imagine, that all *was going on rightly and smoothly*! It is to prevent *you*, and also to prevent the Catholics, from being deceived, in this respect, that I write this Letter. Mr. CROKER "*seconded the motion*"! Mr. CANNING came on his *crutch* to give it his "*cordial support*." Mr. PLUNKETT *praised* the mover; and the mover *praised* Mr. PLUNKETT! These are strange and wonderful circumstances; unless we believe (which is a little too much just yet), that the *millennium* is actually arrived. However, before I say more on what I suppose this proposed *Bill* will contain, on the manner in which I think the discussions will end, and

on the means which the deadly foes of the Catholics have employed, are employing, and will employ, I will now remark on the *speech* of Sir Francis Burdett; or, rather, on the speech ascribed to him by the report in the Morning Chronicle.

Taking the speech as a whole, it is one of the most cold, feeble, absolutely impotent pieces that I ever read in my life. There is scarcely, in behalf of the Catholics, a good reason, well stated, from one end of it to the other. One would have expected, upon such an occasion, a strong picture of the *still-existing grievances* of the petitioners. Instead of this, (which we find in no part of the speech,) we have observations tending to induce thoughtless persons, or persons not very well informed on the subject, to look upon the Catholics as being rather *impatient*, if not as being somewhat *ungrateful*, in forgetting *benefits* received. "I could wish," says Sir Francis, "the Catholics to *remember, that it is only within these few years that benefits, one after another, have been conferred on them.* I could much rather they should retain this in mind, than the remembrance of the grievous injuries which have been inflicted on them; for it

"would be wise to *cast forward* their eyes, and see how certain it is that that system of conciliation, only commenced in the last reign, must be speedily and completely accomplished. (Hear, hear!) If the Catholics, satisfied with resting their hopes on the reasonableness, sound policy, and justice of conceding their claims, should so far *restrain themselves as to take advantage of the benefits* they have received, and forget the injuries that are long past, I think it quite impossible they should fail in *convincing this House* and the country, for they may feel the most perfect assurance, that *unless the peace of the country be disturbed*, the enlightened mind of England would crown their efforts with complete success."

This is delightful stuff, to be sure. What "*benefits*"? And benefits, too, "*conferred*" on the six millions of people of Ireland? These benefits consist in a *diminution of the quantity of injustice and cruelty* formerly inflicted. So that, if a man beat me and rob me daily for a long while, I am to thank him for the "*benefit*" he *confers* when he ceases to beat me, and continues to rob me! This is using the word "*benefit*" in a new

sense. "Benefit" does not, with this orator's leave, mean to *cease to do harm*; but to *do that which is good*: and, to become *less unjust* than he was before never yet entitled a man to the appellation of *benefactor*.

And, pray, what does he mean by the Catholics "so far *restraining* themselves as to take *advantage*" of these "benefits"? How is *restraint* to enable them to take this advantage? But, in short, all this latter part of the passage is sheer nonsense; except what is said about "*convincing* this House"; and that is something a great deal *worse* than nonsense. Good God! After all that you and I have heard him say; after all that he has said in the House itself; after all that we have seen, heard, and known, of "this House"! After all this, to hear him talk thus; and to hear him bid the Catholics *rely* upon the *conviction* which they would, *in time*, be able to produce in "this House"!

He, in another part of the speech, speaks of the *danger from without*. Alluding to the *French*, he says, "they have passed through the country, and have made themselves acquainted with the sentiments of the people, and they accuse England of hypo-

crisy in expressing a sympathy for the negroes, and a desire to get rid of the Slave Trade, whilst she maintains a *tyranny the most cruel over the Catholics of Ireland*, than whom no class of men ever suffered more *oppression* and *injustice*. (Hear, hear.) These sentiments, which we see constantly in the French Papers, ought in themselves to excite suspicion in the breasts of Englishmen, and should urge them strongly to consider how they could *cure this great evil*, the *continuance of which exposes the country to constant peril*. This is the time to consolidate our resources, and to conciliate all parties—if it is omitted, no man can answer for the consequences. I would, therefore, address myself to men of all parties, and, founding the question upon policy and justice, I would appeal to their good passions as well as their bad, to their feelings of patriotism as well as their self-interest, and would tell them they ought all to unite in the necessity of doing justice to the people of Ireland." This is very good. Nothing can be more reasonable; but, what does he mean, then, when, towards the close of his speech, he says, that the measure he has to propose

would not be a *panacea*, but would merely “hold out a *future hope*, “and *brighten the prospects* of the “people of that *unhappy country*”? He first tells us, that great oppression and injustice exist; he next tells us, that the *whole kingdom will be in constant peril*, till these be removed; and then he tells us, that he means to propose that which will not be a *cure*, but which will hold out *future hope* and *brighter prospects*! So that the whole kingdom is to be in “*constant peril*” still, this “*future hope*” notwithstanding. He here most clearly intimates his intention *not to propose to grant the prayer of the petition*; and this is, I think, the very first time that I ever heard of a measure, proposed by the presenter of a petition, which measure did not embrace a grant of the prayer of that petition.

The Baronet speaks of the *cost*, to England, of this ill-treatment of Ireland; and, this, to be sure, was, as Sir ARCHY says, “*vary ne-ew*.” It was, however, an argument to use, though so frequently used by others before him, not altogether forgetting my second Letter to the King. But, if he did use this argument, he should have gone into some *detail*, as Mr. HUME would have done; and, indeed, Mr.

HUME ought to have had the petition. He would have shown *how much*, and in *what manner*, the cost was. The Baronet’s argument is destitute of every thing that could give it force. There was nothing in it to make up for the want of novelty; and the argument, in his hands, became feeble and nothing worth, though this was the strongest ground of all.

If, however, the speech was *cold* as towards the Catholics, it made ample amends when it came to Lord Wellesley, the Orangemen and the Church Parsons, the praises of all of whom it sang in strains of matchless fervour. It is a pity, that, for the sake of these parts of it, the speech had not been in *verse*; and I wonder, that it did not involuntarily break out of the path of plain prose. Speaking of LORD WELLESLEY, the Baronet says: “the Right Honourable Gentleman, the Attorney-General for Ireland (Mr. Plunkett), has told us (and indeed it is quite in conformity with my own opinions), that the liberality of the Marquis Wellesley’s administration has produced the happiest effects in Ireland. When that Noble Lord first accepted the appointment, I ventured to anticipate great benefits for Ireland, and I am quite prepared to give him

"full credit for the best intention
 "to carry his measures into effect,
 "and that with his true warm-
 "hearted Irish feelings and en-
 "lightened mind. The Right
 "Honourable Gentleman states,
 "that, when the Marquis Welles-
 "ley undertook the government of
 "Ireland, he found the vessel of
 "the state like a wreck upon the
 "breakers, and that he enabled
 "her to float upon the tide of pros-
 "perity that has since flowed in
 "upon her; but I hope the govern-
 "ment will not stop there, but that
 "they will trim the rigging, set all
 "to rights, and, above all, that she
 "will be WELL MANNED.
 "(Cheers.)"

Bravo! Three times three for
 that "WELL MANNED"! SWIFT
 has observed, that the
 "vessel of the state," was a figure
 that had got into the servants' hall
 a hundred years before his time.
 Mr. PLUNKETT had, it seems,
 brought it back again; and the
 Baronet clapped it upon his wheel,
 and spinned it out into a fine piece
 of fore-castle wit. But, as to the
 plain facts of the case. The very
 first, or amongst the very first
 things that Lord Wellesley did,
 was to call for a revival of the
 sunset and sunrise law, which
 had, until he arrived in Ireland,
 ceased to exist. About the neces-

sity for this, I know nothing; but
 the fact nobody can deny. The
 prosecution of Mr. O'CONNELL is
 also a fact not to be denied; and,
 though the baronet may think
 these proofs of liberality and
 warm-heartedness, I cannot per-
 ceive how he makes it out, that the
 Marquis's administration has been
 productive of any benefits to that
 country.

As to the "tide of prosperity,"
 it has its source in something very
 different from police and army
 measures. It came over both
 islands at one and the same time.
 Mr. PLUNKETT's figure was a bad
 one: it was inapplicable: for
 small notes do not flow: they fly:
 and he should have said, that the
 Marquis found the bird of the
 state, like a plucked goose, flap-
 ping about in the dirt and mud,
 and that he enabled her, when
 the feathers came, to wave her
 wings once more aloft; and then
 the Baronet, setting his spinning-
 jenny to work (looking archly at
 Mr. PEEL, at the same time),
 might have added, that he hoped
 the Government would not stop
 there, but that they would provide
 a nest for the goose, see the gos-
 lings safely hatched out; and,
 above all things, see them well
 crammed. To drop poetry, who,
 that is not half an idiot, does not

know, that the "*prosperity*," as silly people call it, has arisen solely out of the *paper-money*? Who does not see, that it is this, and this alone, this *desperate* drug, which has proceeded from a part repeal of *PEEL'S BILL*, that has raised wheat from 4s. 6d. a bushel to 9s.? Who does not see, that this has put twice as much money afloat as was afloat before? And who, that has two grains of sense, does not see, that the very sound of war would blow this "*prosperity*" to atoms; and make the situation of the country more perilous than ever?

But, the *Orangemen*; the real *Orangemen*; he *praises* them, and that, too, in terms the most disgusting. "And here," says he, "let me do justice to those in Ireland, who are called *Orange-men*. It was my good fortune, when in Ireland, to have had opportunities of witnessing the conduct of *Orangemen* as well as Catholics, and it is a great mistake to suppose that these gentlemen were at all wanting in their capacities of landlords or their relations to their country, and their dispositions to serve their country were only interrupted by a few *pettifogging hangers on*; and the result of my observation is, that a

"more liberal and enlightened set of men do not exist than the *Orangemen of Ireland*. I speak of them, of course, subject to the exception of that *unfortunate error in their education*; but, with this exception, I found them as kind, or perhaps more so, in manner certainly if not in essentials, *more beneficent landlords than any thing I have seen in this country*." [Hear!] If this be *true*, and if it be *also true*, that (as the Baronet asserts in another part of his speech) the common people of Ireland are "the *most docile* in the whole world"; if these two propositions be *true*, whence comes all the violences, all the nightly assaults, all the vengeful strife, all the cuttings, maimings, burnings, and killings, that we almost incessantly hear of? Whence come they all? Or, is it only in our *dreams* that *Captain Rock* and *Ribbon-men* and the like have ever had an existence? Are all the world *liars*, except this Baronet? Was there no *Skibbereen* affair, and is there no driving for *rent* or *tithes*? Oh! yes: the Baronet allows, that the benevolent offices of the *Orangemen* are "*interrupted by a few pettifogging hangers on*." Bless us! What, all these benevolent Orange "*gentlemen*," who

are more beneficent "landlords than those in this country," suffer their beneficence to be rendered of no use by a few *pettifoggers*! Suffer the "most docile people in the whole world" to be made Captain Rock's men by these few *pettifoggers*! Suffer their country to be kept in a state that renders a sunset and sunrise law absolutely necessary to keep this docile people from actual rebellion; suffer this to be done by a few, and those few "*hangers on*" too! Wonderful indeed: aye, much too wonderful to be believed by any man; and much too barefaced to be pretended to be believed by any one not belonging to the RUMP COMMITTEE; that focus of all that is false, mean and toad-eating.

Mind, he does not speak from report: he says, that his assertion is founded on experience; that he has a *knowledge of the facts* that he relates. I can hardly believe that he uttered the words; the speech may be a fabrication; but, if it be not, there are not, in our, nor any language, words wherein to express the indignation that every just man must feel on the occasion. What, then, all the complaints of the Catholic Association are *false*? All that they have stated about the oppres-

sion and insolence of the Orangemen is destitute of truth. All their measures for protecting the innocent poor Catholics are so many implied libels. In short, they are a *faction* crew whose petition he presents, who have no real grievances to complain of. Yet, in another part of his speech, he is graciously pleased to talk about "*a faction*," who domineers over the Irish people. May one be permitted to ask so consistent a personage, *where* he found this "*faction*?" If he did not find it amongst the Orangemen, *where* did he find it? He was, poor gentleman, many years looking about England "to find a *public*." He found one at last, and then he himself was not to be found. He has now, it seems, found a "*faction*" in Ireland; and yet, somehow or other, he cannot tell us where he found it, or where it now is!

However, there is an *exception* in his eulogium on the Orangemen. He speaks of them, "*of course*," subject to the exception of the "*unfortunate error in their education*." It is a pity that he did not describe to us the *effects* of this "*error*"; for, this might have cleared up the whole of the difficulty. We should then have known, that they were the "*kind-*

est" creatures in the world to their Catholic neighbours and tenants, *except only* that their "education" made them look on them, and treat them as if they were dogs, or something beneath dogs; excessively "*kind*" and "*beneficent*, except that their "*unfortunate education*" made them shoot "lurking fellows," as if they were beasts of prey; and cause innumerable acts to be committed with impunity, any one of which acts would send the perpetrator to the gallows in England. However, with this *single* exception, the Orangemen he found better than the landlords in England; and, notwithstanding this exception, he, if he were not *bound* to England, liked Ireland and the Orangemen so well, that he would go thither to live. And, why not go, then? What *binds* him to this island more than the *Trenches* are bound to that? They live here: why might he not live there? This was what is called *soft talk*: it was overshooting the mark; and overshooting it so far as to defeat the purpose completely. He had to *praise* Orangemen; and no wonder that the *staring*, that must have been upon him at the time, should have bewildered his senses.

Tough, however, as this job was, it was nothing to his *eulogium* on

the *Church parsons*. But, his declarations upon this subject are so *wonderful*, as coming from him, and so curious, as coming from any man, that we must have them on record in his own words. I request you, Electors of Westminster, to read slowly, to put on your considering caps, and to get, if you *can*, by any means, at the *meaning* of this your "glorious representative," who is reported to have said: "Although I am not the advocate, neither am I the adversary, of the Catholic religion, nor the adversary of any of the other various descriptions of religious communities *upon* which men differ, according to the different inclinations of the *human mind*. My own opinion is, that *all religions are equally right*, provided the professors are sincere in their opinions, that *those opinions are founded in sound liberality*, and the *fruits of them are virtuous actions*. (Cheers.) Now I am persuaded that the Catholic religion can furnish as abundant instances of good faith as any other system with which we are acquainted; at the same time I have no hesitation to say, that first of all, bred up as I have been in the religion of the Church of England (and that I

"think is as ample a reason as
 "any man can be called upon to
 "give for his religion), (Hear,
 "hear!) but I am attached to
 "the English Church because I
 "was born in it; and also, had I
 "to choose from all the religions,
 "the Church of England is that
 "which, *as a matter of choice, I*
 "*should adopt.* At the same time,
 "I must say, that it is *not free*
 "*from objections*; there are many
 "things which might be modified
 "and altered: *and with respect to*
 "*the Clergy of that religion,* (and
 "I am *certainly an impartial*
 "*judge,)* *the conviction of my*
 "*mind is, that a more enlightened*
 "*and liberal body of men does*
 "*not exist in any Church in*
 "*the world.* (Hear, hear, hear.)
 "But let it be understood, I do
 "not speak of *Ecclesiastical Cor-*
 "*porations,* for they invariably
 "exhibit at all times, and under
 "all circumstances, the same un-
 "changeable, *narrow-minded,*
 "*dogged spirit of monopoly.* (hear,
 "hear!) In stating this, I do not
 "mean to draw any invidious
 "comparison between the Clergy
 "of the Church of England, and
 "those of any other communion;
 "but I bring forward this great
 "question as *a member of that*
 "*Church* which teaches me 'to
 "do unto others as I would be

"done by,' and moreover, I bot-
 "tom myself on the Constitution
 "of my country, which declares,
 "that all men who *bear equal*
 "*burdens are entitled to equal*
 "*rights.*" (Hear, hear!)

Perhaps, more *saying* and *un-*
saying, more *see-saw*

But, stop: this is a vulgar cor-
 ruption, adopted by Dr. JOHN-
 SON, who says "SEE-SAW (from
 saw) a *reciprocating motion.*"

Yes, DOCTOR; but, what does
 the "see" do there? *See* is no
 part of the verb *to saw.* This
 compound word is made up of the
 French verb, *scier,* and of the
 English verb, *to saw:* and you
 have adopted the corruption

Again I say, more *saying* and
unsaying, more *scie-saw,* more
backward and *forward,* were ne-
 ver, perhaps, before beheld in a
 passage of equal length, while
 the quantity of sheer *nonsense* is
 not small. The Baronet thinks
 all religions are *right,* provided
 the opinions of the professors be
 founded in "*sound liberality*"!

Aye, Sir; but who is to be *the*
judge of this title to rectitude?

You leave us "all at sea" here;
 but, there is another proviso:
 namely, that "virtuous actions"
 be the "fruit of the opinions"!
 Here is room for everlasting dis-
 pute, for, who is to prove, that

certain *opinions* produce virtuous actions? The truth is, that, if we should, before we have done, find the Baronet to be but an indifferent lawgiver, we shall not conclude that he is a much better divine.

The ground of *attachment* to the Church of England is more simple certainly; but, need he have troubled the House with his *profession of faith*? And, more especially, was it necessary for him to declare, in this formal manner, that, "if he had to choose, he would, as *matter of choice*, adopt the Church of England religion"? Was this *necessary*? Was it *wise*? Could it tend to *heighten* men's opinions of his *sincerity*? It was wholly uncalled for by any thing that appeared. It was, in fact, to expose himself, and that entirely *gratuitously*, to those smothered sneers that must have been upon almost every countenance, if, indeed, pity were not the more natural effect. For my part, if I had been present, I should, upon hearing these words come from him, have plumped my chin down upon my breast, and have been afraid to raise it up again till an hour, at least, after he had closed his speech. What! "if he had to choose"! What! "as *matter of*

choice" take that of the Church of England! But . . . he never uttered the words! The broad sheet must have belied him. Belied him in many instances, I hope; but, here *it must have belied him*; or, . . . or, what? Why, he must be that which my pen is wholly unable to describe.

He, good and pious man, has not his religion to choose. That is lucky, at any rate. If he had, he would choose that of our Church, which has St. SWITHIN and St. DUNSTAN amongst its saints. But, yet, to keep up the *scie-saw* (not "*see-saw*"), he "*must say*," that this our religion, the "Holy Religion" of JOHN BOWLES, whom he has so often laughed at, "is *not free from objections*," and that it contains "*many things that might be altered or modified*." Why, then, may I be allowed to ask him; *why* would he *choose* this very religion, if he *had* to choose one? Surely a religion, that has in it "*many things*" that are objectionable, is not one that one would *choose* in preference to all others! Or, at least, this would hardly be the conduct that common mortals would adopt. Then, again, what "*objections*" can there be to this religion, if "*all religions are right*," and all "*equally right*," too; which takes

us, however, rather into the regions of nonsense? But, not to regions so high as we are lifted up to at the close of the passage, where the Baronet rambles out of religion into politics, talks, in strains as high as ever, about the "*constitution* of his country," which he says, "declares, "that *all* men, who bear *equal* "burdens, are entitled to *equal* "rights." What he really means by this, no human being can tell; but, we may, perhaps, be able to guess at his meaning, when we come, by-and-by, to remark on his *intended Bill*, if that bill have been truly described in the newspapers.

However, it is not the *scie-saw*; it is not the *nonsense*; it is not even the *profession of faith*; it is not these, though all of them striking enough, that rouse our feelings here; it is the Baronet's set *eulogium* on the *church clergy*; an *eulogium*, which, coming, and just at this time, too, from any man, might well fill us with indignation; but, coming from *him*, and taken into view with the language of his whole long political life, has created, as it was calculated to do, inexpressible disgust. Not only must he praise them; but praise them, too, for their *light* and *liberality*! He

first asserts, that he is "*certainly* an *impartial judge*" of the matter; and then he asserts, "that a "*more enlightened and liberal body* "of men *does not exist in any church* "in the world"!

He may have an eye to a *salvo* in the last words of this assertion; but, there can be no doubt, that the fair interpretation of his words, is, that the Clergy of the Church are an *enlightened* and *liberal* body of men. Now, then, as to the *fact*; what *proof* have they ever given of being an *enlightened* body? With what works of *real science* do they, or have they ever, furnished the country? Who amongst the *twenty thousand* of them is *famous* for talent, whether in the pulpit or with the pen? What a figure have they recently made, when they had to come forth in argument against the poor Catholic Priests of Ireland? What head have they been able to make against *Methodists*, *Unitarians*, or even *Deists*? What have *they* done, in their capacity of *clergy-men*, to uphold the doctrines of that establishment, which so richly endows them? How comes it, that, in almost every parish in England and Wales, a Methodist parson takes from them full two-thirds of that flock, of whose *souls* they have the care? How does it

happen, that the dissenters from them are *constantly increasing*? How comes it, that, in Ireland, where there are *Catholic* Parish Priests, the Methodists grow *fewer* and fewer in number, while this increase of them is going on in England and Wales? But, not to waste more time in putting such questions, let the Baronet point out to us, if he can, one famous *writer*, or *preacher*, belonging to this his "*enlightened* body of men"; and, if he cannot do that, let him take the contempt which will be awarded to his assertion. What! they "*enlightened*"! They who make not even an *attempt* to answer any of their assailants; that is to say, *with the pen*; but, call in the aid of the *law*, or remain silent! But, it is waste of time to go on: their character and conduct need no illustration: both are well known to every class of the community.

But, the Baronet asserts, that they are a "*liberal*" body of men. Is it in *political* opinions and conduct, or, is it in *money matters*, that the Baronet discovers their *liberality*? Let us ask him, whether, as to the first, he ever knew any public effort made, in *favour of freedom*, that they did not oppose; and whether he ever knew any thing done, *hostile to*

freedom, which had not their support? Let us ask him, whether he has forgotten their addresses in favour of the *Insurrection Act*, in 1812, and in *favour of the Power-of-Imprisonment Bill*, in 1817? Whether he has forgotten their conduct in the case of the *poor Queen*? He finds proofs of their "*liberality*," perhaps, in the conduct of the *parson-justices* generally, and particularly in that of parsons HAY, COLSTON, DENT, and many, many others, though he himself got a *whole three months'* walk about the King's Bench prison on account of his sayings on the memorable *affair of Manchester*. Very "*liberal*" politicians, to be sure, he found them, at the time of passing the *Six-Acts*, and upon numerous other occasions, which, I dare say, he has down in his political diary; but, I marvel, that he omitted to cite, as a proof of the truth of his assertion, their constant, their undeviating, their stern and unrelenting opposition to any relaxation of those very laws, the repeal of which was prayed for by the petition which he, at that moment, had just presented to those whom he was addressing!

As to their "*liberality*" in *money matters*, it is so notorious, the nation has such abundant

proofs of it; it is recorded in characters so legible and so indelible, and in almost every town and village in the kingdom, that the wonder is, that the worthy Baronet should have thought it necessary even to allude to it, much less to make it a subject of formal assertion. It is, as Mr. Ponsonby said of seat-selling, "as notorious as the sun at noon-day." Since, however, this honourable personage did think it necessary to make it matter of affirmative proposition, he might have been pleased to condescend to back up the naked affirmative with some of those numerous proofs with which the parish annals and the Parliamentary proceedings would have so amply furnished him. As a proof of their "*liberality*" as to money matters, he might have stated their well-known generosity as to the collection of their tithes, and, if he had wanted a strong instance, he might have taken that of Saint Andrew's, Holborn, and of those numerous parishes of the City of London, in which Meetings are now holden upon the subject of the *two shillings and nine-pence in the pound*. He might, by only turning over the leaves of the Parliamentary records for the last twenty-five years, have seen the

Acts of 1799, 1800, and 1801 and 1802, wherein these liberal gentry were protected against the lawful informations against them for not residing upon the livings of which they were receiving the emoluments, and whereby they obtained further liberties of non-residence, and also liberty to be *renting farmers*, which the law before forbade them to be. Great as their "*liberality*" was here, he might have found, in the Act of 1814, a further protection against actions for violating even the new law.

As a further proof of their "*liberality*," he might have cited the granting of *sixteen hundred thousand pounds*, raised upon the people, for the *relief* of the *poor amongst them*, while hundreds of Rectors and Vicars held livings with many thousand pounds a year each. While some of the Bishops had more than *thirty thousand pounds* a year each, and while several of these have died of late years leaving each of them upwards of *two hundred thousand pounds* in money. If this proof of the "*liberality*" of this "*body of men*" had not been thought sufficient by the worthy Baronet, that immaculate personage might have referred most triumphantly to their excessive liberality as to the *education*

of the people, and the charity bestowed on them; for, though it might have been difficult, perhaps, for even this "consistent politician," with all his experience, his wide range of knowledge, and his being so "*impartial a judge*" of the matter; though it might have been difficult for him to put his finger upon one single College, one single School, one single Hospital, one single institution of any sort, founded for any of these purposes for this liberal body of men, he might have referred to their universal zeal and activity in collecting subscriptions from the people, to send up to Joshua Watson, wine and brandy merchant, in order that a Society of which Joshua Watson is the treasurer, might provide the rising generation with a suitable stock of principles of religion and morality: and, after having thus shown their excessive liberality as to the minds of the people, he might, by referring to the County Friendly Society established in Hampshire, of which Society the Bishop is the Vice Patron, and the object of which Society is to make the poor provide for the poor; in thus referring, what a proof would he have had that this "*liberal body of men*" are not less disinterestedly anxious for the good of the people's bodies than they are for the good of their minds!

If all this had, however, been thought insufficient, what undeniable proofs of this *liberality* would he have found in the innumerable *tithe-battles* fought in Ireland, where, if all the newspapers be not liars, the dues of this liberal body are not unfrequently collected at the mouth of the pistol and the carbine, where lives

are frequently lost, and wounds inflicted, in these "*liberal*" contests; and where, as in the case of SKIBBEREEN, the contests are frequently of a character, resembling those between the Tartars and the Turks. He might have cited, if every thing else had been insufficient, that which was given in evidence in the Skibbereen case; namely, that the "*liberal*" gentleman said, when sallying forth upon the enterprise, that "*he would have money or blood*"! He denied, indeed, having been *liberal* to this extent, but the witness declared it before the magistrates upon his oath; and it was further declared, and proved upon this occasion, that a sheep seized in payment of tithes was sold by auction for five shillings, and bought in for the use of the "*liberal*" gentleman himself.— This was given in evidence; and, whether we believe it to be true or not, it was a matter to be cited by the worthy Baronet as illustrative of his grand affirmative proposition.

Not to spin out to immoderate length this statement of the proofs, I will conclude with one of a nature to be called in question by no man; and that is, that such is the "*liberality*" of this body of men, that a considerable number of them, having had a call to come from the army and navy and take upon them the *care of souls*, have retained, do retain, have received, and do continue to receive, their half-pay as officers of the army and the navy, though that half-pay, according to the decision of the Parliament itself in the case of his friend Sir Bobby, is *not a remuneration for past services*, but a retaining fee for *future services*;

and, though, by a decision of that same House of Commons, of whose wisdom and rectitude he now talks so much; by a decision of that same House, in the case of another friend of his, Mr. HORNE TOOKE, the clerical character is INDELIBLE, and does not permit the reverend possessor of it to be recognised by the law in any other public capacity; and, of course, these "*liberal*" parsons on half-pay can *never serve again as officers* in the army or the navy, though, according to the aforementioned decision of the Parliament, they *continue to receive the half-pay as a retaining fee for future services*.

There, then, Satan! Shut up your mouth. Ask us no more questions about the grounds of this assertion of this celebrated son of the Established Church. Bring in all your imps, and let them try their best to set aside that assertion of "*liberality*," which has thus been put forward by the pious zeal of this personage, who, if he had a religion to choose, would, of all others, choose that of the Church to which this liberal clergy belong.

This part of the Baronet's speech is so complete in itself, that one cannot help lamenting that there should have been any thing subjoined tending to weaken its excellent effect. We can easily perceive that the fervency of the Baronet's piety was here taking its full and natural sway; yet, so attached does he appear to have been to the system of *scie-saw*, that even here, in spite of his holy fervour, he could not help falling into it. After having, in this unqualified manner, praised this "*liberal body of men*," he comes

halting with an exception with regard to "*Ecclesiastical Corporations*." He does not, zealous son of the Church as he is, pretend to say that *they* are liberal. *They*, on the contrary, are narrow-minded, "*dogged*," and always given to monopoly! What does the man mean? What can this son of the Church mean? *What monopoly?* Monopoly of religion or monopoly of profit? No matter. *They* are narrow-minded, *dogged*, and grasping at monopoly. Now, then, great son of the Church, *who or what* are they? What do you mean by Ecclesiastical Corporations. Do you mean the Bench of Bishops? Do you mean the Deans and Chapters? What other Ecclesiastical Corporations are there? And, if you mean these, what are these but the Clergy of the Church of England? And, if these be narrow-minded, *dogged*, and fond of monopoly, what becomes of your assertion relative to the "*liberality*" of the body of the Clergy of that Church?

Electors of Westminster, I ought, perhaps, to beg your pardon, for seeming to suppose that this commentary, or any part of it, was necessary. The nonsense, the inconsistencies, the self-contradictions of this speech are so numerous and so glaring, that it seems to be almost impertinence to point them out. There stands your Member with a Petition in his hand, which petition prays for a measure to relieve the Catholics from their sufferings under the tyranny of the Orangemen. He begins by concurring in the prayer of the petition; and he next tells the petitioners that they ought to look at the benefits which

they have received, and not at their grievances that remain unredressed. He next says that the country will be in constant peril until these grievances be redressed: and then he says, that he does not mean to propose a measure to redress them, but merely a measure to hold out hope in prospective. He represents the poor Catholics as ground down to the earth by a faction; and then he represents the Orange faction, as consisting of the most enlightened, most kind, and most liberal of all mankind. He represents the Church in Ireland as operating in a manner very grievous to the people; and then he represents the Clergy of this Church as the most *enlightened* and *liberal* body of men that ever belonged to any Church that ever existed. He represents Ireland as the most enchanting of countries, and the common people as the most docile of any upon earth; he says he would go and live there if he was not bound to England; and he applauds the government of the Marquis of Wellesley, which has a law to shut that docile people up in their houses from sunset to sunrise, and which law, if it were not absolutely necessary to preserve the peace in that happy country, in which he would like to reside, would be the most shameless act of tyranny that ever was exercised upon the face of the earth. He gives us, unasked for, his profession of religious faith; he asserts that all religions are *equally good*, but that the Church of England religion is *the best*. For this reason, he would, if he had to choose, take this religion as a matter of choice; and then he tells us that there are *many things objectionable in this*

religion, notwithstanding all religions are equally good. Last of all comes his general eulogium on the light and "*liberality*" of the Clergy of England; and then, under the appellation of Ecclesiastical Corporations, he shuts out the whole of that clergy from the benefit of his eulogium.

Why, Gentlemen, this must be a fabrication, or, if it be not, what does all this trimming indicate? What are we to augur from such barefaced backward and forward assertion. It indicates that the orator did not clearly see his way, that he was got into a new path; that he felt himself moving upon quags and quicksands; and, in short, that he meant to turn about, to place himself openly in a way that he had never trodden before; but that, he was full of fears, full of anticipated dangers as to the consequences. If, however, a paragraph which I am now about to quote from the *Old Times* newspaper contain truth, or any thing approaching to truth, the mystery is at once cleared up; for if this paragraph be not a libellous lie, the Bill which this pride of Westminster is about to introduce, will contain a provision, which will not only be not consistent with the professions of his whole life, and particularly with those professions which chiefly recommended him to your support; but in direct contradiction to all those professions; and, moreover, discovering a wish, and a settled intention, not only not to do what he has always promised to do to the utmost of his power; but, to do that which, as far as in him lies, will make that infinitely worse, which he has many times represented as the greatest of all the curses that ever were inflicted

upon a nation. However, before I proceed further, let me insert the paragraph to which I have here alluded, and which I take from the *Old Times* newspaper of the third day of this present month of March. "The framers of the present measure, it is understood, meditate two distinct provisions, by which the comfort and usefulness of the priesthood will be increased, and their capacity for mischief neutralized. 1. A subsistence is to be provided for the Catholic Clergy out of the national purse; and, 2. The forty-shilling freeholders, the pauper-constituents of the county representatives, will be disfranchised. — By the first of these enactments, the clergy will be more closely connected with, and dependent on, the State: by the second, the order of electors, who have, in fact, no property to lose, and no intelligence to govern them—who might be tools in the hands of any incendiaries, and convertible by intriguing priests to whatever purpose they thought fit to turn them, will exist no longer: not having votes, they will no longer be multiplied by their landlords, while the 10l. freeholders, with property to guard, with independence to support them, with sense to guide them, will be above the machinations of disturbers, lay or clerical, and will form the basis and the nucleus of an agricultural yeomanry in Ireland. If the Bill does these things, it will do great good."

"Impossible!" you will exclaim. "Impossible, that Sir FRANCIS BURDETT, the great Reformer; the Friend of Universal Suffrage; Westminster's

Pride; the incorruptible Patriot, who had '*the people*' constantly in his mouth; the undaunted Champion of Popular Rights: impossible," you will exclaim, *that he should ever be the organ of this measure of sweeping disfranchisement!*" Aye, Gentlemen, and I also should have thus exclaimed, at any time before the year 1817: but, since that time inclusive, I have seen him do so little for the people, and so much against the people; I have seen, in short, that of him, that makes me hesitate, to echo your exclamation, and say that this thing is impossible. It is, indeed, a proposition, or, rather, two propositions, which one can ascribe to nothing short of an inherent love of every thing that is cruel and despotic, and treacherous into the bargain. I would fain believe it to be utterly impossible. It is so diabolical, that I should be reluctant to impute the intention even to CASTLEREAGH'S self, were he alive: but, after the eulogium on the Orangemen; and after the profession of faith; after the high-sounding praise of the clergy of the Church of England, who, observe, were always his most bitter enemies when he bestirred himself in behalf of the people: after all these, I am compelled, in spite of my wishes, in spite of the strong bias of my mind, to hesitate in pronouncing this to be impossible.

Let us, however; let us, Electors of Westminster, not be the dupes of our own political integrity. Let us, for argument's sake, suppose the thing possible, and let us examine into the propositions accordingly. This paragraph I find in the *Old Times* newspaper. That paper has long appeared to me to be the great

organ of the Baronet, his Rump and other "hangers on," as he is pleased to denominate the oppressors of the Catholics of Ireland. You have perceived, perhaps, as well as I, that this vile paper has constantly been endeavouring to work in favour of the Baronet and his crew, with a zeal proportioned to their hostility with regard to me. Possibly, therefore, I may strain my suspicion of the authenticity of this article beyond that point to which, of itself, it would naturally go. However, without presuming that such a measure is intended to be proposed by the Baronet: without supposing that the vile wretches who conduct this paper have his authority, or any authority at all, for saying that such a measure as this is to be proposed, let us take the article as a mere publication in a newspaper; and let us examine the propositions which it contains. Let us leave the intentions of Sir FRANCIS BURDETT wholly out of the question; and then let us see what would be the character of this measure, if, at the suggestion of the vile author of the paragraph, such a measure were to be attempted to be carried into effect.

The measure is to be two-fold: First, *To tax the people of the whole kingdom for the pecuniary support of the Catholic Priests of Ireland.* Second, *To prevent the forty-shilling freeholders of Ireland from voting at Elections in future; or, rather, to disfranchise all freeholders, who have not freeholds with ten pounds a year.* One can hardly put the words upon paper; one can hardly refrain from flinging down the pen from indignation and rage, at the bare reading of propositions so profligate and so diabolically tyranni-

cal. Still, however, let us go on if we can; let us see what it is in reality, which this impudent writer tells us is to be proposed by the Champion of Parliamentary Reform.

As to the first proposition; that of paying the priests out of the general taxes, it is, observe, brought forward by the enemies of Catholic emancipation. This is one thing not by any means to be overlooked. It is avowed here, that the effect of such provision would be to render the Catholic Clergy "*more dependant upon the state.*" This it would do, to a certainty; and the *Old Times* newspaper can tell very well what are the effects of such a dependance. Neither Catholic priests nor Catholic laity ask for this payment. It is the first time that we ever heard of stipends being forced upon people; but when we look at the object which this writer has in view, we are not at all surprised that he should propose the employment of such force. But let us see how this measure would affect us Protestants of England, upon whom nineteen-twentieths of the burden would fall. The Church which we are compelled to support tells us, inculcates in our minds unceasingly, that the doctrines of the Catholic Church are false, and lead to perdition. It teaches us that the worship of that Church is idolatrous, that the doctrines of that Church are damnable; that the head of it is the "man of sin" named in the Revelations of SAINT JOHN; that the Catholic Church is the "whore of Babylon;" and that it is the "beast with seven heads and ten horns." Far be it from me to say that this is true; far be it from me to say this; but it is true, or it is

false; at any rate, it is taught us by that Church to which Sir FRANCIS BURDETT is so firmly attached, and the religion of which he would choose in preference to that of all other churches, if he had ever to choose his religion. Well, then, what a pretty proposition is here, to come, too, as this writer tells us, from this very Sir FRANCIS BURDETT. If he were to bring in a Bill to impose taxes on us for this purpose, it ought to be entitled a Bill to compel the people of England to support a worship that is *idolatrous* and doctrines that are *damnable*. He could give it no other title, if he were to act fairly and honestly.

But, upon what principle are we to be called on to support any Church in Ireland? Ireland, like England, is most amply endowed with tithes and church lands. Mr. Hume has proved that the revenues of the Church of Ireland amount to three millions of pounds sterling a year. An Irish Bishop has lately died, leaving (as the newspapers told us) more than a quarter of a million of money! He, being a younger brother, must have saved this out of the revenues of his bishopric. The three millions of pounds sterling a year are received by a clergy the whole of whose flocks amount to no more than about *four hundred thousand persons*. In numerous parishes, the livings of which are very valuable, there are no Protestants at all. In great numbers of parishes there are no churches. So that here are *three millions of pounds sterling annually* received by a clergy who have scarcely any flocks. And, Gentlemen, Electors of Westminster, are we to see Westminster's Pride proposing to vot emoney out

of your pockets to support a Catholic Church in Ireland, while this Protestant Church, the clergy of which he says are the most "*liberal*" in the world, are to continue to receive that three millions of money without one penny of deduction! Will you see this in silence? Would you suffer such an outrage upon your purses as well as upon your good sense, to be committed, and suffer yourselves to be prevented by a Rump Committee from making an effort to protect yourselves against such injustice and such an imputation on your public spirit and understanding.

I am amongst the last of men to oppose any law that shall provide a decent maintenance for the Catholic clergy, provided that the maintenance come without rendering them the dependants of the State. But, Gentlemen, surely the means of providing this maintenance ought to come out of the revenues of the Church of Ireland. That church, as Mr. HUME has most clearly demonstrated, has its revenues with scarcely any flocks; and, will Sir FRANCIS BURDETT say that it is to retain all its present revenues; and that, in order that it may retain them quietly, your purses are to be sweated, that your window-tax and house-tax are to be kept on, in order to make a provision for those priests who really have the flocks? In this country, the persons who go to Meeting-houses are much more numerous than those who go to the Church. The Methodists have their preaching tub in every parish, and generally their flock exceeds in number that of the parson of the parish. What, then, would Sir FRANCIS BURDETT call upon us to pay taxes

for the support of the Methodist
 rsons? With just as much rea-
 Pa so he might, as to propose the
 measure suggested in this vile
 paragraph of the *Old Times*.

All the Church revenues formerly belonged to the Catholic Church. I have no objection to the restoring of those revenues to the Catholic Church in Ireland, where six sevenths at least of the Catholics are still Catholics; but I have a great objection, and I am sure you will have the same, to being taxed to support the Catholic Clergy, while the Church Clergy enjoy the whole of that which was taken from the Catholics. If it be right to make us pay for the support of a Catholic Church, why may we not as well go to it and belong to it at once? Surely it cannot be either sinful or inconsistent to belong to a Church that we give our money to support. Here, then, would be a measure of real and effectual relief. Let the Catholic Priests have a trifling stipend (and they want no more), give them the use of the churches, and let the nation take the tithes and church property into its own hands. There would be sense in this, and, above all things, there would be justice in it; but, to make us pay for the support of a Church against which we protest, while all the provision that has been made for the Church by our ancestors is engrossed by those who are teaching us to continue to protest, could be exceeded in injustice and insolence by nothing short of the other branch of that monstrous measure proposed by the *Old Times* newspaper.

Pray mark once more, that neither Catholic Clergy nor Catholic Laity ask for this provision.

What is it then that can induce this *enemy* of the Catholic Church (as the *Old Times* newspaper professes to be, observe) to propose this giving away of our money. Why, those who are in possession of the revenues of the Church of Ireland, wish to keep that possession. The possession is endangered, and the whole country is endangered (as Sir FRANCIS BURDETT tells us) by the discontents of the Catholics. The Catholic Clergy have great influence with their flocks. *Make these men dependant upon the State for their bread*, says the *Old Times* newspaper, and then, "*their capacity for mischief will be neutralized*;" that is to say, they will, when they depend upon the State for their bread, become tools in the hands of those who enjoy the good things in Ireland, and will thus be made instruments in keeping the people quiet, and in making them contented while the possessors snugly enjoy those good things. This is avowedly the motive of the measure which Dr. Brodie's paper proposes; and, if those who enjoy the good things in Ireland were to pay the stipends in Ireland out of the result of those good things, our objection to the proposition would in part be removed; but to threaten to come to us and to sweat our purses for this purpose, is the most impudent thing that ever was put forth by mortal man. And will your Member propose it? Will he come to you for window-tax and house-tax, to be sent over to Ireland, in order to ensure this tranquillity to the possessors of the good things there? Will he do this thing at last? "*Impossible!*" again you exclaim; and,

for the honour of human nature, I wish I could join in the exclamation.

Scandalous, however, as such a proposition would be, it falls short, after all, of the turpitude of the second proposition contained in this vile paragraph. For, what is this proposition. Nothing short, my old friends, of a complete *Anti-Reform* of Parliament. Nothing short of a complete disfranchisement of a vast majority of the present freeholders of Ireland. We have here, as a justification of this proposition, all the old battered arguments of the villanous Boroughmongers. These freeholders, they say, have "*no property to lose, and no intelligence to govern them—they might be tools in the hands of incendiaries.*" For thirty long years this was said to Sir FRANCIS BURDETT in answer to all his arguments in favour of extending the right of voting in England. They are the very words which the Boroughmongers and their tools have a thousand times made use of. He contended, on the contrary, that every man had a right to vote, because every man was liable to be called on for the defence of the country, both in person and purse. It would be useless to remind you how strenuously he contended for this right; how strenuously he contended against all qualification whatsoever; quite useless, because as you well know, and as he also well knows, it was this very thing that recommended him to your notice, and that made him your Member. Are we to believe, then, that he; aye, that he himself will be the author of a Bill to diminish the number of voters in Ireland; that he will bring in a Bill to take away a very large part of the votes that

now exist in that country: that he will, in short, give the lie direct to all his professions, repeated almost incessantly during a period of nearly thirty years.

But, Gentlemen, this is far from being all, or any thing like all, that is contained in this proposition. It is not a refusal to admit people to *become voters* that is here contemplated: it is a *disfranchisement of those who are already voters*. The Septennial Bill, against which you and I have heard him so often and so justly inveigh, was a mere trifle in point of injustice to what the acting on this proposition would be. Though MILTON has called *necessity* "the tyrant's plea," necessity did really exist in the case of the Septennial Bill; for, it was a question whether that Bill should pass, or the House of Stuart be restored to the exclusion of the present family. This was simply the question of that day; and yet there were not wanting many men, and those amongst the most celebrated for talent and virtue, who reprobated the passing of that Bill. What, however, was that Bill, compared to what a Bill would be founded on this proposition? The members had been chosen to sit for three years, and, having been chosen for three years, they voted that they would sit for seven, and that, too, without appealing to those who had chosen them. This was so outrageous a stretch of power, that many men who were real friends of the House of Hanover, thought that a civil war ought to be risked rather than commit such an outrage. But, here, in the proposition of this vile newspaper, we have a project, not for prolonging the power which the electors have put into the hands of their repre-

sentatives; but (hear it, Electors of Westminster!) for making use of that power for *disfranchising those from whom it was derived!* And, those, too, the "*most docile people upon the face of the earth;*" and, to finish the climax, by means of a Bill to be brought in by a man who declares that he would rather live amongst that people than amongst any people in the world!

"Impossible!" you will again exclaim, "impossible that *our* Sir FRANCIS; that Westminster's Pride and England's Glory should propose such a measure! What! he who has for thirty years been the advocate of popular rights; he who was reading Magna Charta to his son when the Horse Guards came to take him to the Tower; he who called us to *come forth* and demand our right of Universal Suffrage; he who has been ready to shed tears twenty times before us, when commenting on our debasement by the borough-mongers; he propose such a measure; he propose to disfranchise hundreds of thousands of men who are not to be heard in their defence, who are not only without crime, but without the imputation of crime; he propose this! No!" You will say, "*our* SIR FRANCIS cannot be so shamelessly base!"

Gentlemen, it is impossible to be cool upon such a subject: if one could, one might reflect a little on the consequences of such a precedent as this. If a large part of the freeholders of Ireland are to be disfranchised, because they have no "*property to lose*, and "*no intelligence to govern them*, and may be made tools in the "*hands of incendiaries;*" if this

numerous body of men are disfranchised on pretences like these, and because they can be led to elections in droves by their landlords, what security can there be, pray, for the forty-shilling freeholders of England? Are not they led in droves to vote at county elections? Do not Sir John, and Sir Thomas, and Sir William, and my Lord, or their stewards or bailiffs, march them like soldiers to the poll? Does not Sir FRANCIS's own steward act his part in this way? It were to be wished that this were otherwise; but does any one propose to disfranchise these men on this account? The boroughmongers never made such a proposition; and, after all, the dependance is not so complete as that the forty-shilling freeholders have no independent influence upon county elections. It is a little something, at any rate, which the people hold in their hands as a check upon the Aristocracy. It must be the same in Ireland: it must be a little check; and even this little check this base writer would have removed; and that, too, by an act of tyranny more barefaced than was ever yet witnessed in the world.

The scheme of this profligate writer is, manifestly, to open the Parliament nominally to the Catholics, and to take from them, at the same time, the means of being put into it; but, Gentlemen, observe how the precedent would act with regard to themselves. If men, who are *freeholders*, whether the freehold consist of the fee or of the life-interest, if these freeholders can be thus disfranchised, where are we to look for an objection to the DISFRANCHISING OF YOU. You are merely inhabitant householders,

paying *scot and lot*. This vile writer represents the forty-shilling freeholders of Ireland; and, mind, he is not about to stop at forty-shilling freeholders, but to go up to freeholders of *nine pounds nineteen shillings and eleven pence three farthings*; he proposes to disfranchise all under ten pounds; that is to say, more than nine-tenths of the present county voters. All these he calls "*pauper-constituents*." He well knows that there are no *paupers* in Ireland. He well knows that there are no poor-rates, and no persons that the law denominates *paupers*. But, if those who have a freehold (and in a cheap country, too,) which is worth from forty shillings to ten pounds a year; if all these "*have no property to lose*"; if all these are to be disfranchised, "*because they may become tools in the hands of incendiaries*"; if this be the description proper to be applied to these persons, and if such is to be their punishment, even without a hearing, without crime committed or imputed, what is the description to be applied to YOU; and what think you will be your fate in a very short time, if a measure like this were to be adopted, and that, too, on the proposition of your own Member. Nineteen twentieths of you have neither freehold nor leasehold, and may be turned out of your houses at the end of any year! And, be you assured, that, if this measure were to pass, or any measure resembling it, you would not have a vote even at the next Election, unless that election come very soon!

And, would you suffer the Rump, with such a measure before the House, still to keep you in that torpid state in which they have so

long kept you. Would you again meet to celebrate *purity of Election*? Again see the white charger, and the banner, emblem of purity, carried triumphantly before the Hero of *Radical Reform* and of disfranchising "*emancipation*!"

However, be assured, that such a project will end in nothing but the indelible disgrace of the projectors. Such an outrage on all law and justice; such an abomination, will not take place. If the advice of this insidious writer were to be followed to a certain extent, the measure would be stopped in its progress. If coupled with any thing called Catholic Emancipation, it would form the fairest possible ground for rejecting that Emancipation altogether; and it seems impossible to believe that it could be coupled with any measure for the relief of the Catholics, except with a settled design of refusing that relief, and, observe, *refusing it, too, with the hearty approbation of every good man in the kingdom.*

WM. COBBETT.

TREES AND SEEDS.

I HAVE NO more trees for sale this year. I am sorry for this, it being a disappointment to a great many gentlemen; but, I cannot sell that which I have not.

Swedish Turnip Seed and *Mangel Wurzel Seed*. I have some of the very best of both. The former is 1s. 3d. a pound, if ten pounds are taken; and 1s. 6d. if a less quantity. The latter, 2s. 3d. a pound, if ten pounds: and

2s. 6d. if less. I warrant them both, having grown them myself from picked and transplanted roots. Please to apply at No. 183, Fleet-street.

ASH TREES.

I HAVE about *twelve thousand*, which have been *removed*, which have fine roots, and are, on an average, three and a half feet high, which I will sell for *thirty shillings a thousand*, if the whole together, and *two pounds a thousand*, if less quantity. I will *pack and send off* from London at my own expense.

OAK BARRELS.

ANOTHER parcel of these, if they should not be all taken by the *Methodist Conference*, (to whom I have offered them,) I shall have for sale next week.

CATHOLIC APPEAL.

IN consequence of the base conduct of the London daily press, I have published this *Appeal*, price a *halfpenny*, or *three shillings a hundred*. Any Gentleman in the country, who wishes to distribute it in his neighbourhood, may be instantly supplied by writing to No. 183, Fleet Street.

PROTESTANT REFORMATION.

THE FOURTH NUMBER was published on the 1st instant.

MARKETS.

Average Prices of CORN throughout ENGLAND, for the week ending Feb. 26.

Per Quarter.

	s.	d.		s.	d.
Wheat ..	66	0	Oats	23	3
Rye	40	9	Beans ...	38	8
Barley ..	40	6	Peas	40	4

Corn Exchange, Mark Lane.

Quantities and Prices of British Corn, &c. sold and delivered in this Market, during the week ended Saturday, Feb. 26.

	Qrs.	£.	s.	d.		s.	d.
Wheat	6,453 for	22,529	0	10	Average,	69	9
Barley	6,099....	13,612	9	5.....	44	7	
Oats..	13,961....	17,878	7	5.....	25	7	
Rye.....	13.....	24	15	0.....	38	0	
Beans..	2,383....	4,616	13	11.....	38	8	
Pease ..	974....	2,220	17	4.....	45	7	

Friday, March 4.—There are small arrivals of Wheat, Barley, Beans, and Peas, but a fair quantity of Oats this week. Wheat is much more in demand than of late, and the prices are reported 1s. to 2s. per qr. higher than on Monday. Barley is unaltered. Beans and Peas fully maintain last quotations, Oats sell freely on rather improved terms.

Monday, March 7.—The arrivals of most sorts of Grain last week were more inconsiderable than of late: This morning there are short sup-

plies of Wheat, Barley, Beans, and Peas, from Essex, Kent, and Suffolk, and several vessels fresh up from northern ports with Wheat and Oats. Samples of superfine Wheat are still scarce, and such have obtained 2s. per qr. advance on the terms of this day se'nnight, and a few picked samples have obtained 80s.; other qualities are also rather improved in value.

Barley of prime quality sells freely at last quotations, but other sorts go off very heavily. Only Beans that are dry find a brisk sale. Peas of both sorts have no variation. Oats meet buyers on much the same terms at last quoted. In the Flour trade there is no alteration.

Price on board Ship as under.

Flour, per sack	60s. — 65s.
—— Seconds	56s. — 60s.
—— North Country ..	52s. — 55s.

Account of Wheat, &c. arrived in the Port of London, from Feb. 28 to March 5, both inclusive.

	Qrs.		Qrs.
Wheat...	4,159	Tares.....	167
Barley..	3,490	Linseed ..	3165
Malt....	3,501	Rapeseed..	450
Oats....	16,233	Brank	382
Beans ...	782	Mustard ..	176
Flour ..	2,116	Flax	—
Rye.....	2	Hemp	—
Peas	666	Seeds	—

Foreign.—Wheat, 1320; Barley, 1680; Oats, 3825; Beans, 20 qrs.; Flour, 2623 b.

Total Quantity of Corn returned as Sold in the Maritime Districts, for the Week ended Feb. 26.

	Qrs.		Qrs.
Wheat ..	36,687	Oats	35,886
Rye	294	Beans....	7,387
Barley ..	41,463	Peas	2,231

HOPS.

Maidstone, March 3.—There has this week been quite a stir in the Hop trade, and we have heard of some lots being disposed of at much better prices (say several shillings per cwt.) than were even thought of a few days back.

Monday, March 7.—The arrivals from Ireland last week were 5,633 firkins of Butter, and 2,408 bales of Bacon; and from Foreign Ports 1,876 casks of Butter.

SMITHFIELD, Monday, March 7.

Per Stone of 8 pounds (alive).

	s.	d.	s.	d.
Beef.....	4	6	to	5 2
Mutton....	5	0	—	6 0
Veal	6	2	—	7 4
Pork.....	5	6	—	6 6

Beasts	2,317	Sheep ..	14,580
Calves....	114	Pigs.....	130

NEWGATE, (same day.)

Per Stone of 8 pounds (dead).

	s.	d.	s.	d.
Beef.....	3	8	to	4 8
Mutton....	3	8	—	5 0
Veal	4	0	—	6 8
Pork.....	4	8	—	6 8

LEADENHALL, (same day.)

Per Stone of 8 pounds (dead).

	s.	d.	s.	d.
Beef.....	2	10	to	4 4
Mutton....	3	10	—	4 6
Veal	4	0	—	6 8
Pork.....	4	4	—	6 8

Price of Bread.—The price of the 4lb. Loaf is stated at 11d. by the full-priced Bakers.

POTATOES.

SPITALFIELDS.—per Ton.

Ware	£ 3	0	to	£ 5	0
Middlings.....	2	15	—	3	0
Chats	2	15	—	0	0
Common Red..	0	0	—	0	0

BOROUGH.—per Ton.

Ware.....	£ 3	10	to	£ 5	10
Middlings.....	2	10	—	3	0
Chats	2	0	—	2	10
Common Red..	4	0	—	4	10

HAY and STRAW, per Load.

Smithfield.—Hay....	60s.	to	95s.
Straw...	42s.	to	52s.
Clover..	80s.	to	115s.
St. James's.—Hay....	63s.	to	105s.
Straw...	37s.	to	52s.
Clover..	80s.	to	100s.
Whitechapel.—Hay....	66s.	to	95s.
Straw...	42s.	to	48s.
Clover..	84s.	to	110s.

COAL MARKET, March 4.

Ships at Market. Ships sold. Price.

15½ Newcastle..	10½	30s. 6d.	to	38s. 6d.
2½ Sunderland..	2½	34s. 9d.	—	40s. 3d.

COUNTRY CORN MARKETS.

By the QUARTER, excepting where otherwise named; from Wednesday to Saturday last, inclusive.

The Scotch Markets are the Returns of the Week before.

	Wheat.			Barley.			Oats.			Beans.			Pease.		
	s.	to	s. d.	s.	to	s. d.	s.	to	s. d.	s.	to	s. d.	s.	to	s. d.
Aylesbury	76	80	0	38	44	0	25	30	0	32	48	0	44	46	0
Banbury	70	76	0	42	46	0	23	30	0	32	50	0	0	0	0
Basingstoke	62	75	0	32	47	0	20	28	0	38	50	0	0	0	0
Bridport.....	60	68	0	30	40	0	21	23	0	44	0	0	0	0	0
Chelmsford.....	64	80	0	32	38	0	26	30	0	0	0	0	34	50	0
Derby	70	74	0	38	50	0	24	30	0	46	52	0	0	0	0
Devizes.....	52	76	0	35	47	0	22	32	0	42	53	0	0	0	0
Dorchester	55	60	0	37	43	0	24	29	0	48	56	0	0	0	0
Exeter.....	64	75	0	36	40	0	22	24	0	44	48	0	0	0	0
Eye	66	72	0	36	46	0	24	30	0	36	42	0	36	38	0
Guildford	60	85	0	35	48	0	25	32	0	40	48	0	42	47	0
Henley	67	82	0	26	50	0	19	31	0	31	50	0	40	49	0
Horncastle.....	58	68	0	32	44	0	18	28	0	38	48	0	42	45	0
Hungerford.....	44	70	0	28	38	0	18	28	0	40	54	0	0	0	0
Lewes	67	72	0	42	43	0	24	26	0	40	45	0	0	0	0
Newbury	50	77	0	24	47	0	19	30	0	38	50	0	40	48	0
Newcastle	52	66	0	32	46	0	19	27	0	38	44	0	38	57	0
Northampton....	74	76	0	41	46	6	22	27	0	39	50	0	0	0	0
Nottingham	67	0	0	47	0	0	26	0	0	51	0	0	0	0	0
Reading	60	85	0	32	51	0	20	32	0	36	44	0	40	50	0
Stamford.....	58	76	0	37	48	6	21	30	0	32	56	0	0	0	0
Swansea	66	0	0	34	0	0	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Truro	67	0	0	37	0	0	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Uxbridge	64	88	0	36	50	0	25	32	0	36	50	0	42	46	0
Warminster.....	50	74	0	27	53	0	24	30	0	36	58	0	0	0	0
Winchester.....	66	80	0	34	45	0	24	29	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Yarmouth.....	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Dalkeith*	30	36	0	28	32	6	16	22	0	18	23	0	16	20	0
Haddington*....	30	37	0	24	32	0	16	23	0	16	21	0	16	20	0

* Dalkeith and Haddington are given by the *boll*.—The Scotch *boll* for Wheat, Rye, Pease, and Beans, is three per cent. more than 4 bushels. The *boll* of Barley and Oats, is about 6 bushels Winchester, or as 6 to 8 compared with the English *quarter*.

Liverpool, March 1.—Since Tuesday last, and throughout the whole of the past week, there was a progressive improvement in the Corn trade, both at this and the country markets of the districts. And at the market of this day, although the importations have been pretty considerable, some parcels of superior Irish Red Wheat were purchased by speculators at 10s. 2d. to 10s. 3d. per 70 lbs; and our farmers freely obtained 10s. 6d. to 11s. for their finest qualities of New, which forms an advance of 9d. per bushel upon their prices of this day se'nnight. Fine Irish Oats were held steadily at 3s. 9d. per 45 lbs., and Flour was at an advance of 2s. per sack. There was not much inquiry for old Wheats, but they are fully 4d. to 6d. per bushel higher. For Malt and Barley an advance of 3d. per bushel was demanded, but few sales were effected in these articles.

Imported into Liverpool, from the 22d to the 28th Feb. 1825, inclusive:—Wheat, 9,064; Barley, 747; Oats, 15,352; Malt, 2,524; Beans, 765 and Peas, 136 quarters. Flour, 2,839 sacks, per 280 lbs. Oatmeal, 596 packs, per 240 lbs. American Flour, 1,000 barrels.

Bristol, March 5.—Corn sells rather more freely at this place than it has done, and the following prices are nearly correct.—Best Wheat from 8s. 9d. to 9s.; new ditto, 6s. 6d. to 8s.; inferior ditto, 5s. 3d. to 6s. 3d.; Barley, 3s. to 5s. 9d.; Beans, 4s. to 7s.; Oats, 2s. 3d. to 3s. 3d.; and Malt, 5s. 6d. to 8s. per bushel. Flour, Seconds, 30s. to 53s. per bag.

Birmingham, March 4.—We continue to be scantily supplied with good Wheat. This article has advanced about 6d. per 60 lbs., and Flour 2s. per sack. Good Barley is scarce, and is worth 1s. to 2s. per quarter upon the currency of this day se'nnight. Other articles freely maintain last quotations.—The retail price of fine Flour has risen to 3s. 4d. per 14 lb. and 2s. 10d. for seconds.

Ipswich, March 5.—We had to-day but a short supply of every thing, except Beans, and prices were higher. Wheat, 2s. to 3s., and Barley, 1s. to 2s. per quarter.

Boston, March 2.—A short supply of Wheat occasions the millers to give an advance to-day, but it is not generally acceded to by the merchants, superfine samples alone being in request. Oats come more freely; still they fully support prices, and bright samples are rather dearer. Barley more in request this week, and some quantity sold on last week's terms. Beans rather dearer, for dry samples and such as will do for seed.

Hull, March 4.—The demand for Wheat to-day was fully equal to the supply. The best descriptions may be noted full 1s. per quarter dearer, and in some instances a further advance; but the damp and inferior did not participate in a similar improvement. The finest Barleys were in request, and met ready sale, 1s. to 2s. per quarter above the currency of this day week. Oats were in free sale, and a shade dearer. The market was overloaded with new Beans, and but few sales could be effected.

Lynn, March 3.—Our Market was well supplied with Wheat, and having a good demand, the finest samples realised an advance of 1s. to 2s. per qr. Barley may also be noted full 1s. per quarter dearer, and free sale.

Yarmouth, March 3.—Our market on Saturday was moderately supplied with Wheat, and the buyers showing a disposition to purchase, more money was given, say 2s. per quarter. Barleys were also a free sale, and dearer 2s. per quarter.

COUNTRY CATTLE AND MEAT MARKETS, &c.

Norwich Castle Meadow, March 5.—There was not an abundant show of Stock here to-day; neat Stock were very scarce; Sheep continue to maintain the high prices last quoted:—Fat Beef and Mutton, 8s. to 8s. 6d. per stone of 14lbs.; Fat Pork, 7s. to 7s. 9d.

Horncastle, March 5.—Beef, 7s. to 7s. 6d. per stone of 14 lbs.; Mutton, 6d. to 7d.; Pork, 6d. to 7d.; and Veal, 9d. to 10d. per lb.

Bristol, March 3.—Mutton, 7d. to 8d.; and Pork, 5½d. to 6d. per lb. sinking offal.

At *Darlington Market*, on Monday last, being fortnight day, there was but a short supply of Cattle, sales remarkably brisk:—Beef, 6s. to 7s.; Mutton, 7s. to 8s. per stone, sinking offal.

Manchester, March 2.—On sale 1955 Sheep at 7d. to 8½d. per lb. sinking the offal; 502 Cattle, at 5d. to 8d.; 30 Pigs, 3 Calves, 6d. to 8. per lb.—Total 2490.

At *Morpeth Market*, on Wednesday, there was a good supply of Cattle and Sheep; being a great demand, both sold readily, the former at an advance in price.—Beef, from 5s. 9d. to 6s. 6d.; Mutton, from 6s. 6d. to 7s. 3d. per stone, sinking offal.

AVERAGE PRICE OF CORN, sold in the Maritime Counties of England and Wales, for the Week ended Feb. 26, 1825.

	Wheat.		Barley.		Oats.	
	s.	d.	s.	d.	s.	d.
London*	69	7	43	6	26	1
Essex	71	4	43	3	26	8
Kent	67	10	45	0	25	2
Sussex	68	7	40	1	25	5
Suffolk	69	1	39	7	26	2
Cambridgeshire	65	6	41	0	20	6
Norfolk	66	10	38	8	24	7
Lincolnshire	65	6	41	2	22	4
Yorkshire	62	7	40	0	22	9
Durham	61	2	40	3	23	6
Northumberland	59	10	39	0	23	3
Cumberland	64	5	35	0	22	5
Westmoreland	64	10	37	0	24	6
Lancashire	67	1	39	8	23	9
Cheshire	66	0	49	7	25	4
Gloucestershire	66	10	43	1	26	9
Somersetshire	66	11	40	4	21	9
Monmouthshire	68	2	41	10	23	5
Devonshire	65	10	38	5	21	0
Cornwall	63	7	36	11	23	4
Dorsetshire	66	11	38	4	24	9
Hampshire	65	8	38	4	23	8
North Wales	64	6	41	1	20	4
South Wales	60	3	34	2	18	8

* The London Average is always that of the Week preceding